

### **REMARKS**

The Office rejects claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10-13, and 15-21, and objects to claims 4-6, 9, and 14. Applicant amends claims 1-4, 8, 12, 16, and 19. Claims 1-21 (9 independent claim and 21 total claims) remain pending in the application.

The Office indicates that claims 4-6, 9, and 14 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Support for the various amendments may be found in the originally filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTIONS**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10-13, and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,926, issued October 20, 1998, assignee is Fujitsu Limited) in view of Katsuyama (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,710, issued April 28, 1997, assignee is Fujitsu Limited). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

#### **Claims 1-3, 7, 16, and 19**

Tanaka in view of Katsuyama fails to teach, advise, or suggest "the third character element is selected when the distance with the character element of the designated second character element string is within a predetermined range with respect to a reference distance that is an acceptable value of the predetermined distance based on a reliability when character-recognizing the first character element" as recited in claims 1, 16, and 19 (and claims 2, 3, and 7, which depend from claim 1).

As conceded by the Office, Tanaka is silent about disclosing similarity between elements as distance. The Office alleges that Katsuyama discloses having a degree of similarity being defined as a distance.

The degree of similarity in Katsuyama is defined as a reciprocal number of a called city block distance.<sup>1</sup> First, Katsuyama fails to disclose "the third character element is selected when the distance with the character element of the designated second character element string is within a predetermined range". Second, Katsuyama

<sup>1</sup> Katsuyama, column 14, lines 20-22.

fails to disclose "when the distance with the character element of the designated second character element string is...with respect to a reference distance that is an acceptable value of the predetermined distance based on a reliability when character-recognizing the first character element".

**Claims 8, 10, 11, 17, and 20**

Tanaka in view of Katsuyama also fails to teach, advise, or suggest "a plurality of character elements having the possibility of being concatenated with the specific character element are predetermined" and "determining whether a character element string obtained by concatenating the specific character element of the plurality of character elements with one character element of the plurality of character elements, the one character element being different from the specific character element, matches at least a part of the second character element string" as recited in claims 8, 17, and 20 (and claims 10 and 11, which variously depend from claim 8).

**Claims 12, 13, 15, 18, and 21**

Tanaka in view of Katsuyama also fails to teach, advise, or suggest "obtaining a probability that a search result matches a second character element string, based on the number of the second character elements, which is a searching keyword, included in the second character element string, and a number of the second character elements, which is a character recognition result including errors, matching corresponding first character elements out of the second character elements included in the second character element string" as recited in claims 12, 18, and 21 (and claims 13 and 15, which variously depend from claim 12).

Thus, Tanaka in view of Katsuyama fails to teach, advise, or suggest one or more of the claimed limitations, so that claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10-13, and 15-21 are patentable over Tanaka in view of Katsuyama.


**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**CONCLUSION**

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is thus requested. Applicant invites the Office to telephone the undersigned if he or she has any questions whatsoever regarding this Response or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9-7-05

By:   
Shahpar Shahpar  
Reg. No. 45,875

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**  
One Arizona Center  
400 East Van Buren  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202  
Phone: (602) 382-6306  
Fax: (602) 382-6070  
Email: [sshahpar@swlaw.com](mailto:sshahpar@swlaw.com)

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**